background information

FOR CHURCH AND SOCIETY

March 1959 No. 22

Featured in this Issue

		Page
I.	Christian Thinking in Britain on Social Ethics and Action By Canon Ronald Preston (With comment by The Bishop of Sheffield, The Rev. David L. Edwards, and Prof. William S. Tindal)	1
Other Articles		
II.	The Church in East Germany	11
III.	Population, Socialism, and Universal Suffrage in India	18
IV.	The Church and Nation in Central Africa - Two addresses from the Copperbelt Conference on Rapid Social Change	22

LIBRARY
World Council of Churches
150, route de Ferney, GENEVA

ckground Information presents material on important developments in ciety in order to contribute to a realistic ecumenical discussion of e Church and social issues. It is distributed by request to a limited mber of interested persons. It may not be directly quoted without per-ssion. Background Information is compiled by the staff of the Depart-nt on Church and Society of the World Council of Churches. It does not present the views of the World Council, its Departments, or its staff.

epartment on Church and Society
IVISION OF STUDIES - WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
7 route de Malagnou - Geneva - Switzerland

Notes on this issue.

Great Britain was in the 30's and 40's the source of the most stimulating writing on Christian social ethics. One thinks immediately of the writing of William Temple, Maurice Reckitt, J.H. Oldham, A.D. Lindsay, V.A. Demant and others. Their articles and books provided inspiration for Christian social thinking around the world. What is the situation in Britain today? The outsider may suspect that interest in these questions has dried up with the coming of the Welfare State. We have asked Canon Ronald Preston, a well-known student of Christian ethics in Britain, to report on present developments. The Bishop of Sheffield, The Rev. David L. Edwards of the Christian Frontier staff, and Prof. William S. Tindal of Scotland have sent interesting comments on his article. In fairness to Canon Preston we must add that other leading churchmen and laymen whom we asked for comments replied they were in substantial agreement with his report.

The situation of The Church in East Germany may appear to illustrate the well-known French saying "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose". The report of a correspondent on that situation indicates ways in which the Church seeks to cope with new aspects of an old and tense conflict.

Judging by the inquiries for extra copies, many of our readers were interested in the statement of Dr. Myrdal to the parliamentarians of India on the problems of economic development in their country as published in our last number. The second instalment of Dr. Myrdal's report, again slightly condensed, is equally thought-provoking.

The two statements on Church and Nation in Central Africa (as well as the brief statement on the Christians and Race p. 17) are taken from the conference on the Christian responsibility for rapid social change, held in the Copperbelt of Northern Rhodesia, November 20-25, 1958.

Mr. Henry Makulu is a young Christian leader on the staff of the World Council for Christian Education in the Copperbelt. Sir John Moffat is the son of one of the pioneer missionary families in Central Africa and himself a leading exponent of increasing opportunities for Africans in political and economic life of the Federation of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

We regret that space does not permit us to publish more of the interesting addresses from this meeting which was attended by 75 leading pastors and laymen from Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and the Belgian Congo. The official statement by the members of the conference will appear in the next issue of the Ecumenical Review (April 1959). The full report on the deliberations at this meeting is available from Mr. Peter Mathews of the Christian Council of Northern Rhodesia (Box 1192, Kitwe, Northern Rhodesia).

I

CHRISTIAN THINKING IN BRITAIN ON SOCIAL ETHICS AND ACTION

by

Canon Ronald Preston

British Christian thinking in the sphere of social ethics is so scanty and diffuse that it has been impossible readily to write about it. There is no solid academic tradition of teaching in the subject (as in the U.S.A.) out of which a steady stream of books is likely to come. It is, in fact, the cinderella of theological studies in Britain. In the realm of fundamental studies we have no book corresponding to e.g. Brunner's "The Divine Imperative"; the chief British contribution has been the attempt of Bishops Kirk and Mortimer, when holders of the Chair of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford, to resuscitate traditional moral theology in an Anglican setting. Professor V.A. Demant, the present holder of the Chair, has been giving Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews University with the title The Penumbra of Ethics, casting both a wide net over the whole of civilisations ancient and modern, as well as dealing with concrete problems; so when these are published (and no date is announced) there will be a fundamental book in this field emanating from Britain. At present the only British book which I have felt moved to add in the last two years to my basic reading list for the students I teach in Christian ethics at Manchester University is a Roman Catholic Dominican symposium The Springs of Morality. It has many short contributions covering a very wide field, but its significance lies in its strong empirical note. It criticises explicitly and implicitly much of traditional moral theology (on which, of course, Kirk and Mortimer have worked) for being too rigid, static and deductive, in very similar fashion to recent thinking among French Dominicans. It tries to work towards "middle axioms" in social ethics, approaching by a different route the point reached by much of the ecumenical study that went into the Oxford Conference and the Amsterdam Assembly, but which has not been developed much since then, though it is implicit in the social study programme of the World Council of Churches.

Failure to take due note of empirical evidence has been the weakness of British Christian social thinking. In some quarters it stemmed from sentimentalism, but in those who were closest to traditional catholic moral theology it was due to a theology which drew too much detail out of the concept of "natural law" and so by-passed empirical studies with a good conscience. The penalty was increasing irrelevance. It is significant that the group of Anglo-Catholic "Christian sociologists" has broken up. It was responsible for publishing an enormous lot of nonsense about economic problems because its members dismissed economics on a priori grounds and would not study it. Professor Demant himself shared in this and has been effectively criticised by Mr. Denys Munby (who lectured in economics at Aberdeen University and is now at Oxford) in an appendix to his book Christianity and Economics, published a couple of years ago. Mr. Munby has a general sympathy with much of Prof. Demant's approach, which makes his criticism the more significant, though it perhaps prevents him really getting to grips with the natural law issue.

As I say, with the exception of the one Roman Catholic work, I am not aware of any significant book in Christian social ethics emanating from England, Ireland, Scotland or Wales in the last two years and referring to the British scene. Anothe Roman Catholic book, however, Christian Democracy in Western Europe 1820-1953 by Michael Fogarty (Professor of Industrial Relations at University College, Cardiff) is a most interesting analysis of the origins of the Christian Democratic movement in the Low Countries, Western Germany, France, Switzerland, Austria and Italy, and a particular study of their post-war role since 1945. It shows how they evolved policies acceptable to the mass electorate of modern times by shedding a good deal of their traditional conservatism and accepting from the liberals the separation of Church and State, a market economy and private property rights, and then from the socialists a defence of the worker by trade unions, state welfare schemes and a certain state over-all direction of the economy. It also shows the weakness of Christian democracy in that a balancing of interests can lead not to creativity but to stagnation (the danger in Italy); also it is doubtful whether they can get furth as purely "Christian" parties (the number of believers being limited). If they develop a more neutral basis their whole raison d'être ceases, and a situation may arise more like that in Britain, with large numbers of Christians in democratic par ties of the right and the left. Certainly few Christians in Britain would like to change to the Western European situation.

A good deal of social experimenting is going on in Church life in Britain, but this article is not asked to deal with that. The Churches are having such a lean time that they are being forced to be more critical about their social and evangelistic activities. Once again there is a question as to how much careful sociological thought lies behind what is done. Canon E.R. Wickham of the now famous Sheffield Industrial Mission has produced a noteworthy analysis of Church and Peopl in an Industrial City, which is excellent on nineteenth century Sheffield, but much vaguer on this century. Its burden is that the Churches never lost the industrial worker because for the most part they never had him, and indeed for a long time had no accommodation for him. The decline of Church-going in the twentieth century is on the whole a middle class phenomenon.

The one area where considerable Christian writing goes on is that connected with marriage and the family, but this is rather beyond the limits of this article. The Church of England is particularly concerned here because the Bishops (with the approval of about 75% of those Anglicans who are vocal) are taking a strong line against any re-marriage of a divorced person. A number of Anglicans are producing books on the subject out of a genuine concern for the family and (often) to justify the Church's position. There is a certain suspicion that they tend to cry "wolf" too easily, to over-stress the evils of divorce without much empirical study of marriage to-day. How do different divorce laws in different countries work out in practice? What is the effect on children of a divorce as compared with the continuation of an unhappy marriage? How do second marriages work out? These and similar questions are rarely faced in Christian writing. An exception to this lack of due attention to empirical evidence is the Moral Welfare Council of the Church of England which keeps in continuous touch with social scientists and social worker its small quarterly Moral Welfare is the best source of Christian comment in this field in Britain. Pressure from it was largely responsible for the government setting up a Royal Commission on the laws relating to Homosexuality and Prostitution, and much the most weighty Christian evidence presented to it came from the Council. The report (known as the Wolfenden report) makes a great advance - as far as homosexuality goes - in British thought. The Council also sponsored a notable report o

The Family in Contemporary Society in preparation for the 1958 Lambeth Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion. This had behind it the work of a full time sociological research worker for twelve months, and was thus a competent survey of demographic trends and of the stresses on family life in certain selected areas of the world (and is thus related to the World Council of Churches survey of areas of rapid social change). In this setting the report contains some original writing on the theology of marriage, and a strong plea for the Church to secure competent technical help and to be ready to work with all who will try and build proper community life in the second industrial revolution now upon us (based on atomic power and automation), and not to let technological forces sweep human purposes aside, with the Church left behind, as in the first industrial revolution.

In this connection there is a fair amount of evidence available from various social surveys of the problems of community and culture in contemporary Britain and of the weakness of the Church in relation to both. A welcome sign of the application of social analysis to Church life is provided by a survey of four Birmingham Anglican congregations by R.H.T. Thompson in a new series Students in Ministry and Worship launched by the SCM Press; it reveals that even within themselves they are far from grasping the corporate nature of their faith.

In a concluding section I refer briefly to discussions in the country as a whole which Christian social thinking must take into account. The development of the welfare state has blurred a lot of formerly clear cut positions on the right and the left, and is compelling a lot of re-thinking, the outlines of which are far from clear. I select two broad and connected issues, daily work and productivity.

1. Daily work. We are far from having got straight a responsible way of treating men in their daily jobs. The old "hire and fire" methods are no longer possible. Industrial management books emphasise the economic sense of having contented workpeople (incidental to their discussions of such subjects as size, efficiency and the hierarchy of management), but this does not deal with the problem of self respect and status in one's work. Management must certainly manage; Immobilisme must be avoided; but man as a producer needs treating as a responsible worker and citizen. Joint consultation so far does not usually get much beyond the three t's - tea, towels, and toilet paper - and in this field we are no further forward than we were in 1920. American management is thought to have given a lesson in how to manage British labour when building the Esso oil refinery near Southampton. It is interesting in this connection to note that there are growing doubts about incentive payment schemes. There is in fact very little evidence to show how far financial incentives affect productivity (partly owing to the difficulty of isolating cash incentives from other factors), but they have certainly caused much suspicion and bad feeling in factories, and are not a very human or responsible way of paying people; so it is noteworthy that the belief that they are the most effective way of securing higher productivity is being questioned. (Incentive Payment Systems, a review of research and opinion by R. Marriott). This point leads naturally to

2. Productivity. The development of the welfare state has reached a stage in Britain where the scope for any further re-distribution of income in favour of the working class (and within it by taxes on beer etc) is very limited. The general national minimum guaranteed to all citizens is still low in some respects (e.g. pensions), and the effort to establish it has resulted in restriction on social investments (in schools, hospitals, prisons etc) and the constant danger of an ever-rising price level becoming an inflation. One way out is to concentrate on greater

productivity; there is a general feeling that Britain has lagged in this respect in the last decade, and both Conservative and Labour Parties are now thinking seriously of the problem. (The Future of the Welfare State, lectures published by the Conservative Political Centre; Twentieth Century Socialism, by Socialist Union; The Future of Socialism by C.A.R. Crosland; Contemporary Capitalism, by John Strachey). All this marks a turn from the static protectionism of the right and the utopianism of the left. It raises once more for the Christian what is his attitude to be towards intensified efforts to raise the British standard of living. It also forces us to consider the view we take of our international responsibilities, because one way of doing this would be to cut down our military and economic commitments abroad, including our responsibilities for sterling, and cultivate our own garden.

- - - - - -

THREE COMMENTS ON CANON PRESTON'S REPORT

(1) Comment from Dr. Leslie S. Hunter, Bishop of Sheffield

With much in Canon Preston's memo, I agree; but it is written from the angle of an academic teacher, and seems to omit or not to see or appraise much thinking of value that is going on up and down the country.

"Thinking on social ethics" will become of small value unless on the one side it is related to religion and theology and on the other to action. Of all studies it can least well be exercised in an ivory tower.

Much of the able theological study in this country at present is under the positive or negative influence of Barth. It is severely Biblical, and often narrowly so. It tends to play into an escapist piety, a 'gathered Church' mystique, without being mystical, and to turn its back on the problems and issues of contemporary society. Men who have responsibility in that society are not getting much nourishment and do not hear much that they can recognise as "the good news" - that, I believe, is also true of Protestant Europe.

To some degree this is an inevitable and necessary phase, though if prolonged it will be a blight and will leave the field open for secular communism. The social thinking of the previous epoch led by men like William Temple, T.M. Lindsay and the Christendom group until it trailed away into economic fantasy, was both coloured by idealism and was related to a pre-war society that has passed away. It could and did discourse in social justice in more general terms than is possible to-day.

Between 1939 and 1951 this country experienced a social revolution: the effects are still working themselves out; and we are occupied in trying to understand them, plot their course and guess their future direction. It has, therefore, to be a period of empirical studies, of much in the nature of solvitur ambulando. Moreover, many of the ethical problems being thrown up both by industry and the welfare state are technical, as well as ethical - rarely are they purely ethical. They do not as yet lend themselves to solution in terms of general principles or moral affirmations. There is, however, a great deal of lively, good thinking going on in the country, within the Church, on the frontiers of the Church and beyond the frontiers, both among men and women who would not call themselves Christians and by those who look for Christian insights and to Christian values. Far more so, I believe, than in the earlier decades of the century.

To give some examples in the three groupings:

1. The churches have at last become aware of industry and of the pressures of industry and the implications of industry in the sphere of human relations, not only in the factory but also in total society, and upon the life and worship of the Church. Here and there, especially here if I may say so, Christians are trying to help industry to think as well as act Christianly, and to try to do it from within industry. It is only a beginning, nearly two hundred years overdue. It also compels some re-thinking of Christian theology and ethics - especially in regard to the secular order. It staggers me that Canon Preston could dismiss Wickham's book on 'Church and People in an Industrial City as "a noteworthy analysis --- excellent of nineteenth century Sheffield" and have failed to see that the history was only prolegomena to a substantial, rugged tough piece of fresh theological thinking with ethical sequels in a long final chapter - appreciated as being of capital importance and of general significance by men as diverse as Prof. T.S. Simey of Liverpool University, Canon Max Warren, the Headmaster of Winchester and the Archbishop of York - though perhaps of little use to men who have to pass an exam in social ethics!!!

2. And although the present trend of theology is away from this field we must not overlook the writings of men like John Baillie, Leonard Hodgson in his Gifford Lectures and Alec Vidler in his interpretation of F.D. Maurice and his own original contributions: while the impact of the Iona Community on Scotland is a salutory shaking of the assumptions of Presbyterial puritanism.

3. Then there is a great deal of informal group thinking and discussion going forward - some stimulated till recently by J.H. Oldham, and some, especially of industrial groups, centred upon and greatly stimulated by William Temple College.

4. Finally, both at the local level and at the national level, University departments of Social Studies, the National Conference on Social Work, and other organisations have promoted some excellent empirical studies like Townsend's "The Family Life of Old People", which are the stuff on which the moralist must work if he wishes to deal with real situations of contemporary life. On the basis of questionnaires, they have also provoked many local enquiries and discussions leading up and into the national conferences which resulted in volumes such as The Family in 1953 and Children and Young People in 1957. (The late S.H. Wood composed a first-rate questionnaire in preparation for the latter Conference).

This lively ferment of group thinking vis-a-vis the Welfare State, Industrial Society and Race relationships, and so on, are what is needed at the present time more than weighty books. These no doubt will come as a sequel in due time. What i regretable is that the Church officially has shown so little initiative in this fie and has left its young members so poorly guided both in the forming of their judgments and in the making of decisions that effect action.

- - - - - -

(2) Comment from The Rev. David L. Edwards

There are some developments in Great Britain which Canon Preston does not ment that might be included in his report. I am writing as one engaged on a book! This autumn the Nuffield Foundation has made a grant to the Christian Frontier Council (a body of about 30 laymen, first drawn together by Dr. J.H. Oldham). The grant is to enable the Reverend Daniel Jenkins and myself - we are both ministers of churche in central London - to do historical and theological research, and to gather togeth discussion groups of laymen who are actively engaged in the social field. We hope that the result of our reflections and consultations will be a book on the idea of equality to-day. We have been given two years for it. But why have we chosen this subject?

The British Labour Party is traditionally the party of the underdog, and it ha been driven by the desire to level the classes. This was to be achieved (1) by State control of the key areas of the nation's economic life; (2) by the taxation of profits, both at source and by a heavy income tax for the shareholders; (3) by improving the education of those financially or intellectually underprivileged, and by closing down the "public" (i.e. private) schools and the other breeding-grounds of snobbery; (4) by changing the whole temper of British society, so that man could speak to man (and woman to woman) without the restraint of a rigid class system. This egalitarian drive has achieved much. The British voter gave it a clear mandat in 1945, and the work of that Labour Government in the fields here labelled (1), (2) and (3) has not been destroyed by the Conservatives on their return to power. But the "public" schools remain, and class consciousness not only remains but in some ways has become more acute. This is because the British people do not want the complete medicine of equality prescribed by the Labour theoreticians. They like living in classes. In many ways they are traditionalists (an example is the immense popularity of the monarchy). The consequence is that, although the natural supporters of the Labour Party are numerically dominant in our heavily industrialised society, the Conservative Party provides the Government of Great Britain, and at the time of writing looks like being returned to power at the next Election (probably 19 An even more important consequence is that the rethinking on the Left, although it has produced quite a volume of books, has not produced a formula to capture the enthusiasm of the people. The Labour Party has, if you like, lost its soul.

On the Right, there has also been rethinking. Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Butler, the two key men in the Conservative Government, and Lord Hailsham, its chief propagandist, are all progressive - just as Mr. Gaitskell, who has a remarkable grip on the Labour Party, is, as befits a former public schoolboy, not ultra-radical.

But one wonders how far the Conservative rethinking has penetrated down to the rank and file of the Party. The average Conservative (e.g. at the Party Conference) is probably still a businessman (or his wife) who wants to keep as much cash as he can for himself and is vaguely resentful about paying for the Welfare State (although he derives many benefits from it). He has no ideal for society. Indeed, one social problem in Britain to-day is that it is difficult to be well-off and honest. Deprived of wealth from share-holding, the middle classes try and get hold of tax-free "business cars", "expenses", etc., and dodge income tax in a variety of ways. Such habits do not breed idealism.

Committed Christians constitute only a minority in Britain (perhaps 15% of the population), but many of them are self-conscious and lively; they are more so than the political parties. Moreover, the Christian religion continues to exact an enormous half-hidden influence (the State schools have daily services and teach the Bible, and millions of non-worshippers listen to the frequent religious broadcasts). And the only live intellectual alternative to Christianity in Britain - "scientific humanism" (Bertrand Russell, etc.) - has not really produced a public philosophy which can take over Christianity's traditional role. Therefore much still depends on the churches. And the main purpose of our book will be to stimulate thought about the contribution which the churches ought to be making to the restatement of the ideal of equality, or to the evolution of an alternative ideal in public opinion.

The churches, one feels, are moving towards a new contribution, comparable (of course, not identical) in its effectiveness with the contributions made in different ways and in different periods of the past to British Conservatism, Liberalism and Socialism.

I am glad that Canon Preston, like myself an Anglican, has paid his tribute to the Roman Catholic intelligentsia - although I would add the caveat that the bulk of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain, including most of the bishops and clergy, has only a narrow, ecclesiastical concern for society (centered on the preservation of Roman Catholic schools).

The Church of England has not produced so much coherent social thinking as has the R.C. intelligentsia, because the C. of E. is currently undergoing a great pastoral and organizational, and to some extent theological, renewal, which absorbs our energies. But the C. of E. as a whole is definitely more awake to social issues, and is more Left-wing in its reactions, than was the case fifty years ago. Archbishop William Temple did not live in vain (although Archbishop Garbett of York was his sole successor as a social prophet with the ear of the nation). An important development occured, recently, with the appointment of Dr. Kathleen Bliss and Mr. Eberhard Wedell to key positions among the officials of the Church Assembly; both are lay, with ecumenical and "radical" backgrounds. Another 1958 move has been the welcome of the Lambeth Conference to many ideas first mooted in ecumenical and Christian Frontier circles. Incidentally, I doubt whether the Christendom Group deserves to be written off with quite Canon Preston's energy. A good survey is Mr. Mairet's The National Church and the Social Order (Church Assembly).

The radical force of the Free Churches - the "Nonconformist conscience" which so powerfully contributed to Liberalism and social reform 1840-1920 - has, on the other hand, diminished. Many Free Churchmen still have a quick eye for abuses in society (e.g. sexy advertising and football pools, both of which evils have increased and are increasing); but many are much more sympathetic than their fathers both to

the difficulties of statesmen and to the instincts of ordinary, sensual, pleasure-seeking people, whom statesmen are elected to serve (e.g. the opposition to pleasures on Sunday is getting less). Some of the officials in the London headquarters of the Free Churches have done a magnificent educational job in the field of social responsibility; one thinks particularly of Edward Rogers of the Methodists and Clifford Cleal of the Baptists. A feature in the scene is the Social Responsibilit Department of the British Council of Churches, which keeps some leading ministers and laymen of the Anglican and Free Churches in touch with each other and with inte national trends. Although one must not exaggerate the strength of the social aware ness (for example, the British Council of Churches hardly does any research or crea ive thinking, because of the limitations imposed on it by the constituent churches) one feels that there are a good many growing points.

What sort of ideal will result? I don't know, but I see a few things.

(1) The British are a kind people, and the old struggle for equality has resu in a new respect for fundamental human rights. The Welfare State is here to stay. Many employers, etc., are genuinely concerned about human relations. Superior wome are not so superior to their servants (when they can get any). We mean to keep a national minimum through the social services - Conservatives are now united with Socialists in this policy. We are beginning to get concerned about the plight of t old (the modern family probably has no room for the grandmother); a writer in a rec Socialist book, Conviction, has advocated a new branch of the social services, to give help in homes which for one reason or another cannot look after themselves.

(2) As a nation we are waking up to the importance of education, technologica or otherwise. There must be "equality of opportunity" for the clever to contribute to society. We are disagreed about the merits of the public schools, the State's grammar (high) schools and "comprehensive schools" (where the State unites the "gra mar stream" in the same educational community with those of lower intellectual atta ments, who normally go to "secondary modern" schools); but at least the debate is keen. Although we are not an intellectual people, on the whole television has been an education, because it has opened our eyes to the riches and variety of the world We are beginning to feel after ways of actually enjoying life, e.g. more civic expenditure, better furniture, better cooking, perhaps even more artistic activity. Although there is much class-consciousness, this is partly because everyone wants t be in the class above and is sensitive as a result. The middle classes want to be upper class ("U" is the phrase). The working classes want to be middle class, and when they move to new housing estates they often do make the change. A joker has suggested that the Labour Party would stand more chance of regaining power if it renamed itself the Technicians' Party.

(3) We are beginning to feel less insular, less confident about our traditio contempt for foreigners. For one thing, we meet more foreigners than in the old days - we escape to European sun and cooking for our holidays, and we wonder wheth as a nation we are doing enough for United Europe; we share London with a fantasti assortment of nationalities (including about 20,000 students from overseas), and although some of us may be colour-conscious in a nasty way (there have been race riots in London and Nottingham), many of us wonder whether we are doing enough for the progress of Africa and Asia. Many of us feel guilty as well as frightened abo the H bomb; there is an active Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. At the height of the Suez 1956 crisis, roughly speaking only intellectuals with some understanding foreign reactions opposed Sir Anthony Eden's adventure. Probably now most people

ould admit that Eden could have acted more wisely. This represents an historic tep in the approach of the British people to emotional adulthood in the modern orld. In the Universities there is quite a popular student movement called "War n Want"; it is concerned about African and Asian standards of living. There are ome signs that the movement is beginning to influence public opinion as a whole. n all this, the international connections of the British Churches have important ducational consequences, as was shown dramatically at the height of the Suez crisis.

- - - - - -

(3) Comment from Scotland by Prof. William S. Tindal

Had Mr. Preston been a teacher in Scotland he would have had more to say about he work of Church Commissions in the sphere of Social Ethics. In May 1940, when he whole life of the nation was threatened, the General Assembly of the Church of cotland appointed a "Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present risis" whose task it was "to seek reverently to guide the Church in the interpretaion of the Holy Will and Purpose of God in present-day events, and to examine how he testimony of the Church to the Gospel may become more effective in our own land, verseas, and in the international order."

In 1948 a Commission was appointed by the Church to examine the influence on ur social life of secular movements and philosophies and especially of materialistic ommunism and to relate the Christian faith to the concerns of common life. This esulted in the publication of a series of reports outlining a Christian critique of ommunism.

The leader of the first Commission. Professor John Baillie, submitted reports n successive years during the Second World War on Church Life and Organisation, ducation, Marriage and the Family and Social and Industrial Life, most of which ere published in a book God's Will for Church and Nation.

The paragraph headings of the Report on Social and Industrial Life show how an ndeavour was made to pass beyond general principles: - A Relevant Middle Axiom - he Tyranny of Private Interests - The Necessity of a Greater Measure of Communal ontrol for the Rehabilitation of our Social and Industrial Life, for the Conscientious Discharge of our World Responsibilities, for the Revitalisation of our Democracy. he relevant middle axiom was to the effect that economic power must be made objectively responsible to the community as a whole, the Commission expressing the convictiion that the common interest demanded a far greater measure of public control of capital resources and means of production than our tradition had in the past envisaged.

In 1942 it was emphasised that the future health of society depended to a large extent on the initiative of the Christian laity. One example of this has been the founding in 1952 of the Scottish Christian Industrial Order, an organisation of Christian laymen in industry with the aim of promoting the best human relations in industry on the basis of the Christian faith and to further the application of Christian principles throughout industrial life. Each member is expected to belong both to a Church Branch and a Work Branch, the latter being the spearhead of the Christian

Church in industry. After six years of experiment it cannot be claimed that there i much to show. The industrial world is a world of its own giving little time for reflection, and it takes much courage to think things through; but a small nucleus is this Christian Industrial Order keeping on trying to discover how to make a Chris tian witness in industry.

W.R. Forrester, Professor of Christian Ethics and Practical Theology in St Andr University, in his book Christian Vocation - Studies in Faith and Work (Lutterworth Press 1951) has made a close examination of the meaning of vocation and has pointed to the crisis in "work" to-day when the sense of vocation has been lost. The first part of the book on "the call" is theological and the second part on "the calling" i sociological. The leaders of the Iona Community, G.F. Maclead and T.R. Morton, have been vividly aware of this same crisis in work and the absence of true community. G.F. Macleod has recently published his reflections in "Only One Way Left" (dedicate to his wife who is always right) and T.R. Morton in "The Household of Faith" speaks of the way in which the Church has been affected by Society and how it in turn affec Society.

The academic philosophers in Edinburgh University have shown a marked concern with the practical issues of the day. John Macmurray of the Chair of Moral Philosophy has written on Freedom in the Modern World, and Constructive Democracy, and now in his Gifford Lectures, The Self as Agent and Persons in Relation, though he uses the methods and terminology of formal philosophical analysis, he claims that such discussion has always for him a concrete and practical reference. This he has expressed in the assertion: "All meaningful knowledge is for the sake of action, and all meaningful action for the sake of friendship." His colleague A.D. Ritchie, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, published Essays in Philosophy in 1948, some of which have the same concern for society: Freedom, The Ethics of Pacifism, Magic in Modern Politics. And now this year there appears a book Christianity, Democracy and Communism by the Professor of Systematic Theology in Aberdeen University, John M Graham. Professor Graham was minister of an industrial parish in Clydeside during the slump of the 1930's, and in Aberdeen was elected Lord Provost and leader of the Labour Party in the City Council. The purpose of his book is to encourage an active political interest among younger church men and women by showing both the importance and limitation of politics.

I agree with Mr. Preston about the importance of the work of the Moral Welfare Council of the Church of England. Some of the Anglican writing on the Christian doctrine of marriage has been studied in Scotland, but in the matter of marriage and divorce our practice has differed since the Reformation. The Scottish Reformers permitted divorce for adultery and desertion but forbade ministers to officiate at the wedding of either the adulterer or the paramour. Since 1938 the State has introdu new grounds of divorce and, in order to determine the Church's discipline, the Gener Assembly appointed a Committee in 1946 to formulate a Christian doctrine of marriage to define the Church's attitude to divorce and the duties of ministers to divorced persons seeking re-marriage. If the Committee's report is accepted the Church will no longer debar one class of divorced persons from re-marriage while permitting it to other classes. The criterion will not be so much guilt or innocence in the past but, where guilt has existed, the presence of sincere repentance, together with the resolve to enter upon a union that shall be in a full sense Christian.

The Report of the Royal Commission on the laws relating to Homosexuality and Prostitution has been discussed fairly widely, but majority opinion in Scotland

would not agree with Mr. Preston that the report (the Wolfenden report) makes a great advance so far as homosexuality goes in British thought. At least in so far as the main recommendation is concerned that homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private should no longer be a criminal offense, the reservation by the Scottish lawyer on the Commission seems to represent a large body of opinion in Scotland. He argued that the fact that activities hurtful to community life are carried out clandestinely and in privacy does not adequately justify the removal of such conduct from the criminal code.

John Knox in the book he brought with him from Geneva defines discipline as "an order left by God into his Church whereby men learn to frame their wills and doings according to the laws of God". We are not so clear today about the order left by God or about his laws. We have books of historical research into social conditions and contemporary thumbnail sketches such as English Life and Leisure: Seebohm Rowntree and Lavers, and The Uses of Literacy: Richard Hoggart, which reveal in unmerciful fashion how far off men are from framing their wills and doings according to the laws of God. We need such books, but it is just these books which compel the admission of our need for divine guidance in the ordering of society.

* * * * * * * * * * *

II

THE CHURCH IN EAST GERMANY

(from a correspondent)

Economic Improvement in Recent Years

First it must be made clear that the DDR (German Democratic Republic) is making steady economic progress. Industry is growing, and manufactured goods are in general of good quality, better than a few years ago. This progress has taken place particularly during the past year and has extended farther than one would have thought possible a year ago. This has meant a solidification and strengthening of the regime. The DDR is capturing her own vital place in the total Soviet economic plan. As the DDR can offer various goods more cheaply than West Germany, the latter has become worried and must compete with many East German products.

Even though the production of consumer goods has not been as high as that of industrial goods, there is noticeable progress even there. One can get more, the quality is better, and ration coupons are a thing of the past.

This economic improvement has an influence on the attitude of citizens of the DDR. Many are becoming resigned and acquiescent in face of the facts. The hope of reunification has receded. Now that the government feels secure, it will push its programme, its ideology ruthlessly. It no longer has to pay any attention to those

who still "have not understood that the course of socialism is the only true course for the future".

Intensification of Ideological Conflict

While up till now they have tried through propaganda and a certain amount of pressure, to make people accept the Communist ideology, and have to some extent bot penalized and yet let alone those who rejected it, they now appear to want the Communist ideology to be put into practice everywhere, notwithstanding the disadvantag that result even for the DDR itself, such as the great number of refugees, especial among the intellectuals - doctors and scientists. The number of refugee doctors had reached such appalling proportions that the Russians asked for a curtailment of the ideological demands of the DDR government; so that the number of refugees, at its highest in August 1958, has now decreased slightly because of a relaxation in the ideological pressure.

A portion of the church population has become resigned. With a certain inner reluctance, people accept involvement - because there is nothing else to do. The situation is clear: a growing economic and political power, which is making its ide logy triumph.

Another portion of the church population believes that it can give only one answer to the regime: "No". "Let us keep our distance, insofar as this is possible Many Christian friends in the DDR would put a question-mark before both these cours

Here are some examples of the problems:

a) Should the farmers who still own their land use every means at hand to avo being absorbed into a communal farm? Should they, because of their Christian calli repudiate any communal ownership as an accessory of Communist ideology? Or should they become resigned and cooperate only passively as members of the collective?... should they as Christians enter the farm collective willingly, that is, allow themse ves to become involved in the new Communist economy, but let their conduct inside i be defined by their Christian faith?

b) Should the Church, when unjustly accused, fight (for the sake of right and truth) to see that these slanders are contradicted, or should it let them pass?... Or should it quite consciously choose not to care, but to pursue its own course, it own task in every opportunity which is still open to it?

A deep difference of opinion has been apparent between on the one hand, the Church authorities, (who want to stand up for the "right", and also to make clear w is "right" as over against the government) and, on the other hand, a number of youn pastors, who think that the Church authorities are neglecting more essential work b engaging in this kind of "trifling", which according to them had nothing to do with the Biblical teaching about justice and righteousness.

c) What should the students do who must make declarations of loyalty like the following?

"I promise to pursue my studies at the Karl Marx University of Leipzig in the light of socialism, actively to support the policies of the government of the

DDR, and on the basis of dialectical and historical materialism to gain a comprehensive education for myself..." or

"My studies are a mark of respect in our workers' and peasants' state. Therefore I undertake the requirement of supporting the policies of the government of the DDR and on the basis of dialectical and historical materialism to gain a comprehensive education which at the conclusion of my studies I shall place at the disposal of our workers' and peasants' state for the extension of socialism.

During the time of my studies I shall cooperate actively in building up socialism in industry and agriculture. I shall obey the constitution, laws and regulations of our state, the articles of my university, and the regulations for study, and shall faithfully fulfill my duties proceeding therefrom.

I bind myself after study in accordance with the legal stipulations to join the pool of university graduates for three years, to work at the place where the organs of our workers' and peasants' state appoint me, according to the exigencies of the building up of socialism."

Looking at East Germany, must we come to a new and different interpretation of the way we confess Jesus Christ as our Lord? This is one of the questions about which we have to think together with our brethren from the East.

Conversation between Karl Barth and Pastors in the DDR

In answer to questions that have been put to Karl Barth from the DDR, he has written a little book, "An einen Pfarrer in der DDR" (To a Pastor in the DDR) - an enlightening book in which many burning questions are dealt with. However, some questions about his definition of "loyalty" have been raised. Barth writes:

"You ask about the possibility of making a declaration of loyalty... I do not know the text of this declaration, but I assume that the signatory does not have to buy a pig in a poke, as was the case with the Hitler oath ("I swear fidelity and obedience to the Führer...") but that this declaration which is required of him contains a definition of the established and existing political system there, the nature of which is fully known to him from the Constitution of the DDR. 'Loyalty' to this system* means honest willingness to acknowledge its existence and to integrate oneself in it, perhaps with certain unvoiced reservations (owing to the "dangers inherent" in it). 'Loyalty' does not mean approval of each and every measure introduced by the actual leaders and representatives of this system. 'Loyalty' involves the right to freedom of thought in respect to the ideology, eventually the right to disagree, if necessary to resist, certain explanations and applications of a given political order. There is also such a thing as loyal opposition. A man is loyal to a given political order if he recognises its validity and authority as they affect himself, and decides to be loyal to it within the limits of what is inwardly and outwardly possible to himself. In your position I would see no

---

*(In what follows I have the 13th chapter of Romans before me, but am also thinking of my own relationship to the Swiss Confederation as laid down in its Constitution!

difficulty in pledging loyalty to the DDR in this sense, and therefore in signing the declaration required of you in all sincerity."

Is he right? Would Karl Barth himself want to apply this passage to the oath required of the students?

Recently there has been an election. Again there was one list of candidates, again the same game of "yes" or "no", by which the government hoped for a public "yes". If one votes, is this merely the 'loyalty' referred to by Barth or is this election a 'vote of confidence'? This is the question that was posed. Some were of the opinion that these elections are a mere formality, so that the only thing one can do is vote. Others saw here a 'loyalty' that was just barely acceptable ("Did Barth mean this?" people asked). Still others saw here a vote of confidence that must be refused absolutely (and were convinced that Barth did not have this in mind). And some thought, that if the Church decided that people should vote in these elections, even the pastors should participate, not abstain as a symbolic act. They are still largely an isolated group who are financially independent of the state. They can therefore allow themselves to boycott the election.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, it must be reported that Barth's little book was received with great joy and thankfulness and that people on every hand were very happy with it; the only hesitation was in fact in regard to his discussion of loyalty and the question of where Barth would draw the line.

Confirmation and Youth Dedication

The old question of the Jugendweihe (Communist youth dedication) is still the central issue. The pressure and threats of the past have given way to one simple approach: if you have not taken part in the Jugendweihe, then you can't be a part of our state, there is no place for you in an academic secondary school, and it is even doubtful whether you will get any chance at a trade or other vocation. More than 60% of the youth took part in the Jugendweihe in 1958 and it is expected that this percentage will increase to 80% or 90% in 1959.

What should the Church do? It is holding fast to the incompatibility of the Jugendweihe and confirmation, but it will not cut off contact with all those who attend the Jugendweihe. In many districts therefore the whole procedure has been changed: instruct all the children, and then at Christmas time send away those who attend the Jugendweihe and bring together the small number who do not go for "Sakramentsunterricht" (instruction in the sacrament).

A study commission from one of the East German churches, which has been set up to examine the question of confirmation, writes as follows:

> "Is confirmation necessary and essential in the Evangelical Church? 'Confirmation' (in the New Testament sense) as a constant strengthening, steadying, comforting, is necessary because of the threats and attacks to which the children of God are exposed in the world. But 'confirmation' (in the sense of a church rite) as a single special act has no Biblical (and therefore no theological) basis; indeed it is in conflict (as ordinarily understood) with true 'confirmation' (in the New Testament sense), which is constantly operative through teaching, preaching, pastoral care and communion.

"The Church knows only one act of reception into membership, and that is baptism. In it Christ declares the congregation to be the one acceptable basis for membership in His body. Through preaching and the Lord's Supper the Church declares that both the ordinary lay members and the leader can be and shall be members of each other. Not, however, because of any single act of having been received into membership. Because reception into membership comes through the Holy Spirit, that is, through faith, and so likewise continuing in membership; therefore there can be no other special act apart from what the Church does, as it has been commanded (and accompanied by promise as well).

"The question of new church regulations is primarily the question of whether we are to let ourselves be led in trust by the viva vox evangelii (living voice of the Gospel) and in trust in this Word, which is the Lord Himself; whether we examine the traditional practices from a folk-church past, neither scorning them and shaking them off nor holding fast to them, as if they were the very foundation of the Church.

"As to the question of the continuance or abolition of the act of confirmation considered apart from the problem of the Jugendweihe, it must be said that children, in the crisis period of adolescence (which lasts longer today than formerly), are being asked for too much in the matter of confirmation. It would be no help to postpone confirmation until a later age, as we cannot make clear why a special act of confirmation would still be necessary besides admission to communion.

"As to the question of the continuance or abolition of the act of confirmation considered in connection with the problem of the Jugendweihe, some say that confirmation answers the requirement of a church people resolved faithfully to give unmistakable expression, by a manifest act with significance to the whole world, to its belief in the triune God, to the will to reside in His congregation, and to thankful participation in the fellowship of Christ's table. If confirmation and Jugendweihe were a question of either/or, parents and children would face a genuine crisis with which God is confronting us today.

"However, the abolition of confirmation, together with a stronger emphasis on communion, would evoke much earlier the result which the defenders of its continuance have in mind. It is questionable if children are held in Christian teaching on a false basis; besides, the experience, seen as a whole, shows the worthlessness of the vow. After carefully weighing all the arguments and counter-arguments, we have therefore determined to propose the abolition of confirmation, especially in view of the unusual situation in the churches of the DDR; and instead to gather parents and children in a new way."

It is clear from these examples that a portion of Christendom in the DDR does not find its course in the choice between "resignation" and an "absolute no", but is seeking for the attitude which Christians must adopt in this society.

The light of the "viva vox evangelii" has no more chance of shining forth when people are resigned and sulking in silence than when they are fanatically calling "no".

Pressure of a Totalitarian State

It is plain from all that has been said that the state wants a complete monopol on the population. A new ministerial decree declares ("Lange-Erlass") that the stat alone - and neither the parents nor the Church - has responsibility for the youth as they grow up. According to this decree all the child's leisure-time also falls even ually under the auspices of the state.

Free formation of groups has been impossible for a long time. There is as a result interference with religious instruction, with attention to the contents, the locality, and the teacher. The school inspector must furnish to the pastor or catechist a license to give Christian instruction or catechism, and must keep an eye on the contents of the lessons to be given.

The inspector has, in fact, the right to examine the pastor or the catechist about his ideological attitude in order to determine whether he can be deemed fit. This right, however, is not being exercised, after a long discussion between Church and government. The inspector gives only an interpretation, without examination. This license must be renewed at regular intervals.

Here again you get the question: should the pastor or catechist submit passivel Or should he (as many think) reject this, and thereby be forced to give up all churc instruction for children? Or is there also a way to try to obtain a license and to give the lessons without passivity, as a free Christian must do?

Views of a Group in the DDR

We close this report by citing the views of a group in East Germany:

"A dialectical materialism which has everyone completely within its grasp, to the nth degree, would in any case leave no room for the individual Christian, the lo cal congregation, or the Church as a whole to exist. For our part, however, we woul be demonising our state and its social order if we were to equate ideology with soci reality. This tendency to demonise, which is very common in Christian and anti-Bolshevik circles, pre-supposes a claim on God, that social realities are to be determined from the Gospel, or (in a more moderate form) that within the compass of a wide personal freedom the Church should also have freedom for all the activities whi it considers necessary. Anyone who makes this claim on God can no longer live in a state of which the ruling group has so different a concept; he has to get out. Or one could only imagine oneself to be a sort of "Fifth Columnist", waiting and watchi for the day when the régime will change. In our view, however, the Gospel of God as the Creator, Sustainer, Reconciler and Judge guarantees us a better existence in the present aeon! We ought rather to place our trust in the God of the New Testament that (even amid the ideology of an atheist state) he will create just as many places in which His children are free to live, act, and (when necessary) suffer for His sak and praise the Lord in their suffering. The fact that the whole world has rebelled against God we do not learn from atheism, but from the Bible; over and over again the Apostles enjoined the congregation, that the Church must seek and find a very narrow path. This means that the Church's existence is always extremely hazardous and beset by temptations. It must therefore be on its guard against condemning a régime outright, and rejecting all the acts and measures of such a régime merely because their basis is ideological. The reasons for the Church's approval or dis-

approval must always be founded on fact, and it must allow its members plenty of scope for personal decision, even if their decisions are different from its own. We will not retaliate against the claims of the ideologised state in which we live by bringing up ideological counterclaims all along the line, as if we had reorganised the universe on ecclesiastical, Christian-humanist or Roman Catholic lines. Because of our recognition of, and respect for, this form of "God's ordinance" we shall be forced at every step to ask at what point we are called upon to say "no", if necessary, with our backs to the wall, i.e. in statu confessionis, whatever the cost."

* * * * * * * * * * * *

CHRISTIANS AND RACE

(Excerpts from a Bible Study by The Rev. I.C. Mumpansha at the Ecumenical Study Conference on Rapid Social Change, held in the Copperbelt of Northern Rhodesia, November 20-25, 1958)

In our country, we have the African on one side and the European on the other. The African, materially has nothing. The only contribution he can make is the supply of labour and thus he is in a position of a servant. The European seems to have everything materially and thus he is the master. Our racial setting being as such, we have tended to lose sight of the values of each other. What is for the African is for the African and what is for the European is for the European.

This type of feeling towards each other, regardless of each other's human values has brought about confusion and spiritual discomfort to those that see and know that our Faith in Christ binds us together. Undoubtedly, this is due to the fact that we tend to ignore the essence of our Christian love and thus our attitude towards each other tends to grow more and more unloving.

The fact is that, we know what is the right thing to do because our Lord told us and still tells us: "Love ye one another as I have loved you, that men may know that you are my disciples". This is simple enough. But what fails us?

(a) We fear the negative reactions of our own society;

(b) The sense of insecurity is cherished on unfounded grounds.

(c) Lack of obedience to the demands of our faith in Christ and His father's Kingdom.

Our racial problem has developed rather in wrong direction. To be exact, the African says: "I will have nothing to do with what is a European religion". And the European will reply; "Never mind, he does not know, after all, he is not many years away from his paganism".

With the former, we see the Christian faith without roots, and with the latter the patience of the Master diminishing.

III

POPULATION, SOCIALISM, AND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN INDIA

(Part II of Prof. Myrdal's speech to the Parliament of India)

1. Population problem

There are certain fundamental facts in the population situation of India which cannot be repeated too often. The population increase is now in India commonly underestimated. The rate of increase is rising. It will probably rise still further, if India has any success in its health reforms and its attempts to raise the level of living.

The rapid and accelerating population increase swallows up by far the largest pa of all India's too small savings and capital formation in purely "demographic investments", which do not contribute to raising the living levels of the masses and advanc the economy. As long as industrialisation cannot absorb any substantial part of the population increase in rural areas - and this is a situation that will remain for a long time to come - the population increase is an eroding force in every village: increasing the pressure on land, causing further fragmentation of the farms, increasi the proportion of the landless, and fortifying the inegalitarian social and economic structure of the village.

The population mechanism, as those who have been working on statistical material know, is a heavygoing and not easily adjustable machine. Even if India from today should have a much lower birth-rate, the population would continue to in'rease for decades ahead. The population in the working age - those who have to be provided job - fifteen, twenty years ahead are already born. In all now foreseeable circumstances India will have more than 600 million people some time before the end of the century. And most of these people will continue to be living in villages. This, however, only stresses the urgency of spreading birth control as rapidly as possible, because otherwise it is difficult to see any real hope for India in the longer future.

This is a most serious situation. And we cannot expect that birth control will come by itself, as it once did in the Western countries. When it came in these countries, it was at a much higher level of living than India has or will have in any nea future - and it will never have it, if it has not first got birth control and stopped the population increase. Nevertheless, I am not a defeatist. History regularly does not repeat itself. In India's situation there are two fundamental differences. They are to India's advantage, if they are utilised.

First, birth control in the Western countries had to spread as a sort of "private enterprise" against the powerful forces of organised society: the law, the Church, the medical profession, the 'ress and the educational structure. This was true even in the Protestant countries; in Sweden we had a law intended to keep down the sale of contraceptives until in the middle of the 30's, when it was a great thing that we finally succeeded to take that law away from the statute book as a result of the great population debate which then began. It is a very different situation when, as here in India, birth control is condoned by organised society: has the backing of Government and Parliament and all enlightened citizens and thus can be promoted as a social reform.

The second thing to which I should like to point and which can potentially mean a tremendous difference to India's advantage is that in our countries birth control was not, and is largely still not, carried out by technical contraceptives. If modern technology were now set to work in the underdeveloped countries this could imply a tremendous difference to their advantage. We who are interested in this problem, are waiting for the inexpensive, innocuous pill or injection which will make a man or woman sterile for a month or, if possible longer. If we had it, and if we used it, the things which are so urgently needed could happen fairly rapidly. And already now we have at our disposal inexpensive contraceptive techniques of high reliability.

I am well aware of the enlightened public opinion, which has been created in India, and the measures which have been taken. I am nevertheless of the opinion that India is not moving with the speed and determination that the very dangerous population situation would motivate. Still too many people in India cling to the illusion that birth control will come by itself as in Europe as a result of industrialisation and education, and the equally mistaken idea that India can afford to wait.

I have noted that your Prime Minister, when he wants to spur an audience to see the realities and the need for more radical action, has taken to the habit of pointing out that we now live in the Sputnik age and should adjust our policies to the much greater urgencies and also the much greater technical possibilities of this new age. I will now, with his permission, use the same argument to him and to you. India has rational reasons, not only to watch for the technological development abroad, but to start medical research of its own to find the ideal inexpensive contraceptive which will do the trick. And India has reason to spend much more efforts on raising a nation-wide campaign, reaching out in all the villages, attempting to spread to the impoverished masses the idea of birth control and give them the rational motivation for birth control.

To this I will only add that though our anxiety in the West twenty-five years ago was in one sense the absolutely opposite - namely a pending population decrease - our fundamental approach to birth control can be identical. In Sweden the question was raised in the middle of the '30's, it was hotly discussed as an important issue should be in a democracy; a population commission was set to work; somewhat later population commissions were set up in Denmark and in Britain also. The conclusions that came out of public discussion and political deliberations were certain principles which are equally valid here.

(1) that children should be born when they are desired after rational considerations on the part of the married couple, and that birth control should be spread to make such "voluntary parenthood" possible;

(2) that society should so arrange by reforms the economic and social conditions for the family that ordinarily people would come to want to have the number of children which would secure the survival of the nation, and

(3) that more important than quantity is the quality of the children born as determined by the economy of the individual family and the social investments made by organised society in the education health and general welfare of the children and of the families.

10. Socialistic pattern and pace of development.

India has decided that its goal is "socialist pattern of society". I have met friends from the United States of America - another great country which through study I have come to know and love very much - and also Indian friends who are honestly afraid that India is asking a too radical course. This opinion might be represented even in this Parliament. I may, therefore, perhaps be permitted to end my discourse today by expressing my opinion as an outside student who is deeply and warmly interested in India's destiny, that the danger is not, as I see it, that you are going too rapidly but is on the contrary, that you will be tempted to try to advance too slowly.

India is still very far away from a socialistic pattern of society - much further away than the countries in the West who do not pretend to be socialistic.

Your public sector is relatively smaller than it is and - except for Britain where the nationalisations are more recent - has ever been in the richer countries in North-Western Europe who are usually not looking upon themselves as very socialistic.

More important is perhaps the question of public controls. While the British left you with a plethora of bureaucratic regulations of all sorts of petty matters which was their way of ruling a colonial people, and while you yourself in the short era of independence have, in the main, not only preserved but in many fields increased these bureaucratic regulations, the big overall controls of industry, trade and agriculture are very much less developed, less comprehensive and effective than they are in those countries. The trade in agricultural produce is for instance regulated by cooperatives and by the State not only in Sweden but equally in conservative Switzerland and in the United States of America. Let me continue illustrating my thesis by pointing out that if we in those countries have not nationalised our banks and our insurance enterprises, the chief reason is that the private firms carrying on these business are so closely controlled by the State that it would not make much difference. Both insurance and important segments of banking have also in our countries come under cooperative management, at least to the extent that there is created an effective competition with the privately run business.

If as a third criterion for the socialist society I take equality of opportunity, it is, of course, plain that India, with its very wide income spans, its existing gulfs of social distance between people in different strata, and its rigidity of class and caste, is much more inegalitarian than all the richer countries including the United States of America, or than many of these countries have ever been. I am saying this not to criticise the policies of India but, on the contrary to explain both why I so whole heartedly can feel myself in agreement with the goal you have set up for yourself, and why my fear is not that you are proceeding too rapidly on uncharted roads, but rather that you might not go fast enough in this era, Sputnik era, when historic forces move very much quicker than in those times when the welfare State was gradually developing in the now rich, progressive and highly-developed countries.

11. Dynamics of universal suffrage.

I have one more thought which wants to come out, before I end. The most explosive element, thrown into the Asian drama is the principle of universal suffrage which all these countries in South and South-East Asia have accepted, almost as if it was something natural that they should, and which in addition, India has had the determination to give life and reality to in election after election and in a parliamentary proxis which has won her the admiration of the world.

This is, perhaps, the most important element of unprecedented newness in India's - and the region's - situation and in its approach to its future. I need not remind you that the now developed countries were not democracies in this sense at the time when they went through the industrial revolution and began to develop rapidly. Suffrage was restricted to only a tiny number of the people in the higher classes by means of narrow economic limitations. Adult suffrage and the work on building the modern welfare State came later, when production and average incomes had reached much higher levels; and these countries were never so poor to begin with, and were never cursed by such glaring inequalities. In fact, political democracy has hitherto never been a permanent success except in rich countries with fairly much of equality of opportunity already attained. Those who have a European background, in particular are apt to remember how all the new democracies rapidly built up on raw ground in Central, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe after the First World War very soon succumbed to internal pressures.

But as I said, history does not always repeat itself. The most important lesson from history is that one should be careful in reading lessons into history. History is not blind destiny but is our choice and is thus of our own making. Everything depends upon the human will and upon leadership - in India's case very much upon decisions to be taken in this House during years to come.

The majority of very poor people who have been given the power of the vote will naturally in time press for substantial economic development and for a more equal share for a rapid progress towards the goals you have set for yourselves. They will do it more and more as they become more rationally aware of their interests and their potential power. The very functioning of the Parliament and other elected assemblies in India and of the public discussion in the Press - and other forums will spur this development, as will also all the social and economic reforms India is giving birth to. The rising level of education of the people from feudal and other tradition-bound blinkers of their minds will have the same effect.

It is for the political leaders to turn this tremendously explosive power of adult suffrage, released for the first time in history in an underdeveloped country, into a concerted and constructive effort towards rapid economic development of an ever more integrated nation. To proceed slowly in this situation would for a democracy be suicidal. Of this, I am deeply convinced.

I know of no task which though immensely difficult, is greater and nobler than the task which is yours, today and in the years to come. It is an inspiring task, and it should be inspiring particularly for the young in the nation, who must now soon take over the responsibilities from your cherished leaders who carry the glory from the successful fight for independence and full democracy.

IV

THE CHURCH AND NATION IN CENTRAL AFRICA

by

Henry F. Makulu

Obstacles to Effective Christian Witness and Responsible Citizenship

In areas of change like Central Africa, true and responsible citizenship cannot find spontaneous expression because of the difficulties and factors which detract the energies of men to develop this responsible citizenship. These are: conflict of cultures where one culture, possessing technological advances and advantages whic lay members of that culture open to temptation to undue and selfish exploitation of members of the other; and this leads to other serious difficulties such as economic differences, class conflict, political struggle; and the whole scene is enveloped by the sinister cloud of racialism. I do not intend to go into analysis of each of these but would like to explain the way in which political struggle and racialism form a barrier to the development of responsible citizenship in Central Africa.

British colonialism is in some ways an advance over other Western colonialisms but it has one inherent feature and that is the differentiation between the ruler and the ruled, without broaching the question of assimilation. Assimilation is even more horrifying, it destroys the people's pride in their culture and their identity. This phenomenon of differentiation is good only to the extent that there does not appear on the scene a settler element which by race identifies itself with the ruler When this happens the struggle for political power degenerates into racial conflict. Under these circumstances responsible citizenship cannot develop because men's energies are spent in struggle for exclusive powers. The superior minority might have a measure of success. In my opinion true and lasting success depends on the genuine sharing of the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

Need for Understanding our Role in the Nation

Since the beginning of colonial rule, indigenous people have been content to be protected by Europeans who also spoke on their behalf. During this period, the African people have, however, been gaining experience through education and travel as well as through contact with people from other parts of the world. The last worl war stepped up the pace of African contact with the world. Many village Africans were suddenly brought under outside influence. There followed a quite unprecedented upsurge of political awareness and economic advance. It was not until 1948, however that an organised political organisation began to appear. Trade unionism among Afri can workers also has about the same span of life. When we realize the stage we have reached so suddenly we see the fantastic speed at which these changes are taking place. It is a revolution that completely confounds the gradualists. With these advances Africans have become aware of their role in the development of the nation. The assertion of this role has been accompanied by some painful adjustments. Young Africans are constantly brought face to face with the difficulties of their country.

They have discovered new loyalties, not to the clan, not to the tribe, not to the chief; but to the national political organisations and the trade unions, with a new kind of "chief" in the leadership of these organisations.

As for the Church it is for the soft, the pious and not for adventurers; it is frequently said that what will save us is nationalism. The meaning behind that is often very obscure. One educated African, a young man, pestered me to buy him some political books known to me. When I asked him why he was spending money on such books, suggesting that he might profit from reading some of the world Christian books written for his age, his answer was typical of many of his age group: "Christianity is a white man's weapon, it is used to weaken the African, but now we have a new weapon to fight them. We have discovered politics, and I want to know more about it." This is a completely wrong conception of politics, but do many of his contemporaries know better? Politics in Bemba and some other Central African languages is translated "argument, quarrelling or fighting"! From this standpoint it cannot lead to the development of responsible citizenship which involves understanding. The way our politicians, both European and African, act gives politics this meaning.

In consideration of the Church and the nation, attention should be drawn to the important fact that we as Christians have to live and serve in the context of this nation however imperfect. In times of trouble the nation looks to the Church for guidance and direction, but more often the Church is not there; what is there is merely a semblance of it.

I want now to draw your attention to some important tasks which lie before the Church and the Christians:

1. In Central Africa with its phenomenal political changes men stand confused as to what their responsibilities are. The Church must help men to understand these to see their role in society as Christian citizens.

2. It must prepare and train men and women to stand the test of change; to work for the removal of those manifestations which lead to tension and which make mockery of the Christian principles of love and brotherhood of man.

3. It must show by Christian charity and witness in daily life our concern and respect for other people even if we disagree with them.

4. Christian leaders in political trade and industrial organisations must be given the necessary spiritual help and guidance to make their witness in these spheres.

These are the things which will lead to the development of responsible citizenship. Now let us see how these principles relate to our situation in Central Africa. For instance, do our people understand what is involved in this important idea of responsible citizenship? Do they understand their responsibilities in a community where there are numerous limitations? Do they see what it is that God is calling them to do in the political situation, and to give effective Christian witness in it?

This leads us to the important task of clarifying our position as Christians in the kind of community in which we live.

Meaning of Responsibility in a Multi-racial Society

In a country like ours where different races live in separate residential areas, and in which one of the races has the advantages of facilities such as better housing enjoyment of protected employment with wages out of all proportion to those of the other racial groups, the tendency is always that each individual sees his reponsibility ending with the people of his own racial grouping. Thus for instance, the African is inclined to say: "What responsibility can I have towards the European community? They have all the political power, they control the economy of the country, they live in the beautiful part of our town and in large, comfortable houses, and I am just one of the ordinary, poor, oppressed and despised Africans. And in any case, if I offered my hand to the European, would he take it? No, the European has everything."

It will surprise many Africans to know that in spite of all this; in spite of the attitude of the European, in spite of the fact that he will not consider the African as having anything to give him, the African still has responsibility towards him just as much as the European has responsibility towards the African. The European stands in need of help from the African even if he does not realise it. The European's attitude towards, and his hate for, the African are only manifestations of his degenerating spiritual and moral self. All this is rooted in fear of domination. I suggest that two of the greatest needs of the Europeans in Central Africa and where the Africans can show their sense of responsibility to Europeans are:

1. In political responsibility: the African will inevitably take controlling positions in the government and in the affairs of the country with the European continuing to live here as his home. How far will the African be prepared to safeguard and respect the interests of the European minority? Will he take a vengeful attitude?

2. The European's materialistic view of life is gradually leading to his spiritual and moral bankruptcy. If the African is poor materially, if he is oppressed, he is at least maintaining his spiritual endowment. If he cannot give anything else to the wealthy and powerful European, he can at least pray for him. Perhaps you ask: "What is the good of offering prayer for someone who does not know, and who, if he knew, could not care less?" The answer is simple: "Pray for your enemies and those who persecute you" and not only for those with whom you live. The essence of prayer is sincerity. The meaning of Christian responsibility in a multiracial society can be crystalised in one sentence: it is "Duty to the nation and concern for others".

These are not mere platitudes of a so-called moderate African, they are words which issue from the teaching of Christ (see Matt: 5: 44-47).

Not Who is Right but What is Right

It is dangerous to throw our young Christians into the turmoil of politics without giving them the necessary guidance. All Christians should feel free to take their place in the national and political affairs of their country - this is what citizenship means. They will discover for instance that party politics in Central Africa is bedevilled by the idolatry of the "Personality Cult". The standard we must give our Christians is this, that in their exercise of political responsibility

their standard must be that they follow and stand for the truth: not who is right but what is right. This is a very important Christian teaching. This does not mean that they should not follow one or the other of the political parties, but rather that they judge the soundness of these parties in the light of this principle. The matter of party politics is an individual choice but in this choice a Christian has both a duty and a responsibility to witness to his Master.

As far as the Church is concerned, it cannot compromise with political ideologies; it must maintain its standard and help to reform rather than conform to society, the parties must see fit to incorporate in their policies Christian understanding of man and society. The Church must not take sides but people should seek to live by the truth.

Finally I want to plead with those who are in positions of responsibility to see their role in society and the nation as a mission. Leadership is a gift given to a man by God. If a man uses this leadership to be worshipped, if he considers himself indispensable, if he sets himself above God, he will be destroyed just as a nation which sets itself above God will be destroyed. The Bible testifies to this in the warnings of the prophets (Isaiah 2: 8-9). We cannot build Christian governments but we can introduce in them Christian leadership which looks to the ministry of Christ. A nation is answerable to God and its responsibility is in proportion to its opportunity and enlightenment. This is the role of the Church in the nation. The Church should be the redeeming power in a faltering nation of sinful men. It should exercise its reconciling mission in the nation in which it is set.

* * * * * * * * * *

THE CHURCH AND NATION IN CENTRAL AFRICA

by

Sir John Moffatt

I must make it clear that my experience is confined wholly to this part of Africa so when I speak of the Church I am really referring to the Church here and when I speak of the nation I am really referring to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

I want to make the point right at the start that the function of the Church here is much wider than it is in a country such as Britain. There, a tradition of Government has evolved over centuries in a homogeneous community and the influence of the Church exercised over these centuries has established that tradition which the citizens now accept as they accept the air they breathe. Here the tradition of morality in politics has still to be established; we are a mixed society exhibiting severe racial tensions; we are evolving and developing at a dizzy pace. The influence of the Church has got to be exercised here within a generation in a mixed society of which only a small proportion professes Christianity. To do this the Church must be bold but not too bold; it must clarify its own thinking on its relationship with the State and it must act in unison when action is needed.

It is clear that the Church has its vital function in every nation; it is also clear that every nation must have some form of Government to enact its laws and to maintain order - government ranging here from Federal and Territorial legislatures to Municipal Councils and Native Authorities. It is also common belief that the functions of Church and State overlap and this gives rise to the age-long argument as to where to draw a dividing line between the two.

The problem of relationship between Church and Nation is a difficult one for which no final answer is possible but I think it is unnecessarily complicated by being examined from the wrong angle. In this land at any rate the procedure has invariably been to take some controversial subject such as the Federal Franchise or the Southern Rhodesian Land Apportionment Act and to argue for or against the Church condemning these laws; when this argument leads nowhere, some people then go to the other extreme and contend that the Government is so evil that churchmen have no alternative but to condemn it whatever it does. I suggest that this approach has been tried and found wanting and that the matter should be examined anew.

It is, I think, wiser to adopt this line: to say that the Church is not concerned with Franchise as franchise or any laws or regulations that governing bodies may care to enact, as a law or regulation. On the other hand, the Church is required to examine every law and every regulation to see that they do no violence to Christian principle. If they do, it is the duty of the Church to protest and to keep on protesting, not against the law, but against the violation of a principle. In this approach which I believe to be the correct one, the answer to the question "Should the Church protest against Law A or Law B or C" the answer is always "No, it should not. But if A, B or C is wrong in principle the Church must protest with vigour, not against the Law but for the principle."

In its relationship with the nation, the Church has a positive function which is far more important than its negative one of rejecting certain actions of the State. The main duty of the Church is not to say "No" when occasion demands it; its objective must always be to create conditions within the state under which the need to say "No" would never arise. This is, of course, a counsel of perfection but the Church must always keep its primary duty in mind. This means that if the State passes a law requiring condemnation, the Church has failed in its primary duty of creating conditions under which such laws could not be enacted. This means further that when the Church must protest against some action as being un-Christian it would be more seemly to adopt the attitude not of the judge on the bench, but one of identification with the culprit in the dock, because the entire Church membership is included in the nation whose action the Church condemns.

But while this main function of the Church is clear and is not disputed, it still has the negative duty of saying "No" to certain proposals made by the State and because we live in an imperfect world, the need to do so is bound to arise. Is it possible to lay down any general rules as a guide to show when the Church is justified in taking such action and when it is not? I think this can be done if we examine the process of Government. It may be possible to determine the point at which any matter ceases to be the concern of the Church as the Church - it never ceases to be the concern of church members as citizens of the nation. The important point to determine is the one at which you as a member of the Church consider that the responsibility of church members as a Church cease; from that point onwards any action you may consider necessary to take is taken as a citizen and voter of the nation.

This question is particularly important for our Federation because we are right at the beginning of things. We have no settled policy as yet, only a label "partnership" with nothing to tie it to. We have all the problems of a young and growing country. In addition we have the complex problems raised by a nation of widely divergent culture and racial origin and these problems are being accentuated by a growing race rivalry.

We must find a route through this tangled jungle of problems, prejudices and fears. To do this we must have pioneering thinking based on the Christian faith. I say this not for what are usually regarded as religious reasons but for the simple fact that as Christianity is true it must of necessity supply the best answers for our problems, and each answer will not only be the best, it will prove in the long run to be the only successful one.

So the first thing the citizens of the nation have to do is to establish the principles within which Government will function. The next is to define policy based on those principles. These two give the basic design which the Federation must follow. I have said that this is the task of all citizens of the nation but because the Church is the nation under its spiritual aspect and because these are spiritual and moral values, these two initial stages are clearly the duty of the Church as the Church. In older societies the Church played its part in these matters by the slow evolutionary process. Here we have the very much more difficult task of producing the fundamental factors of Government within a generation. To me the duty of the Church is self evident here and I hope most of you who are in this hall tonight will agree with this.

It is the next stage in political action which is more controversial - the practical application of that policy and the day to day government of the country. Governing bodies are elected by the citizens to carry out these functions. In all democracies there are widely differing opinions on how accepted policy should be applied and the rate to apply them and you get political parties appealing to the voters for power to govern in the way each party considers to be the best and the electorate picks the group it likes best. I believe that the positive, the active part which the Church should play ceases at this point. It is not the function of the Church to identify itself with any political theory nor to associate itself with any political party. Still less is it the duty of the Church to lay down a timetable within which desirable results are to be achieved. Let us be frank about this. A church has never got itself involved in politics without regretting it because it emerged soiled from the encounter. Further, leading churchmen usually overestimate the speed at which necessary reforms can be made and underestimate the difficulties in their achievement. The Church should play its part in establishing principles and in clarifying policy but must go no further. In the actual application of the policy it must take no part until that application is contrary to Christian principles and contrary to accepted policy. Then the Church must say "Stop, you are going out of bounds."

The obligations of church members do not, of course, stop with the duty of the Church because these individuals are also citizens of the nation. There is no stage at which a citizen of the nation can divest himself of responsibility for what the State does.

When a crisis arises calm thinking disappears. For example, I remember in a recent political issue a churchman said to me that the Church should condemn the

course proposed "Because the Africans are practically unanimous in their oppositic to it". Had this man considered his facts before the crisis arose he should have realised that there is no more reason for the Church condemning a law because Afri cans are practically unanimous in opposition than there is in condemning it becaus practically all Europeans are in favour of it.

This man was confusing his duties as a church member with his duties as a citi of the nation. The argument he used was a valid one in parliament but invalid for the Church. The function of the Church is to maintain moral standards, not to support or condemn popular demands; still less to vote with the majority.

Perhaps an illustration would make my meaning clearer. I will not take any illustrations from recent years because I must avoid political controversy so I will take a case which is likely to arise in the future. In a year or two the question of Dominion Status will certainly become a burning political issue, and what will happen, nobody knows. If the Church says "Nearly all protectorate Africa oppose Dominion Status so the Church must oppose it too" it would be wrong If it sa "Practically all Europeans in the Federation support it so we must support it too" it would be equally wrong. If the Church says that certain undertakings, given at the time of Federation as to how Dominion Status would be achieved, and including promises to administer Dominion Status only when the majority of inhabitants agree, are right, then they must be kept. And if the intention becomes clea of pressing on with Dominion Status and disregarding those promises, then the Chur has to protest unitedly and strongly and continue to protest until the moral principle of keeping ones promises is restored. But in doing this the Church must concentrate wholly on the principle. And provided that is maintained, it is for the State and not the Church to decide if Dominion Status is desirable or not.

Finally, if the Church is to be alive to these issues and is to make its weigh felt when occasion arises, it must make certain that it is keeping its own house i order; there are many subtle ways in which it can betray itself from within. A South African church leader told a friend of mine "The Church does not accept Apar heid because it is un-Christian but in practice our churches are divided into whit and black congregations because the people prefer it that way though an African wo be permitted to worship in a European church if he desired to do so". This is an example of betrayal from within. I hope you noted the expression "European church and not "Christian church"; it is the only honest bit of the entire statement. It is not enough for the Church to condemn a political theory and permit it in practi within its own membership: the Church must demonstrate that it actively repudiates within itself what it condemns in the State. And in case we are tempted to take comfort in the fact that the Apartheid policy is not accepted in the Federation, here is an illustration nearer home. A church leader in Rhodesia once told me tha he thought the Church should protest about the benches in the park labelled "European only". However, there are benches in his church which, though lacking such a label have yet to provide seating accommodation for a non-European. The Church has to watch the national policy because it is the nation under its spiritual aspect; it must watch its own actions no less carefully if it is to have the moral authority it needs to carry out its heavy responsibilities as a moral force and a guiding light in this part of Africa.

* * * * * * * * *